



CRL OP(MD). No.672 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 21/01/2026

PRESENT

The HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

CRL OP(MD) No.672 of 2026

Suresh @ Sureshkannan

.. Petitioner/A2

Vs

State of Tamilnadu Rep by,
The Inspector of Police,
Karaikudi North Police Station,
Sivagangai District.
Crime No.155 of 2025.

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Kathirvelu,
Senior Counsel for
Mr.P.Sureshkumar

For Respondent : Mr.E.Antony Sahaya Prabahar
Additional Public Prosecutor

PETITION FOR BAIL Under Sec.483 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

C-6 B. For Bail in Crime no.155 of 2025 on the
file of the Respondent Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-



CRL OP(MD). No.672 of 2026

WEB COPY

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 02.04.2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 126(2), 109(1), 103(2) of BNS, 2023 @ 191(2), 191(3), 126(2), 109(1), 103(2), 61(2)& 3(5) of BNS, 2023, in Crime No.155 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner and other accused persons murdered the defacto complainant's son for retaliation of the murder of the first accused's father. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has not committed any offences as alleged by the prosecution. He further submitted that it is a case and case in counter and the petitioner is in judicial custody from 02.04.2025. Hence, he seeks bail to the petitioner.



CRL OP(MD). No.672 of 2026

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the petitioner the specific overt act against the petitioner is, he attacked the deceased using Aruval. Further the video depicting the entire scene of occurrence had already been circulated before this Court and that the trial had commenced. Hence, he opposed for grant of bail to the petitioner.

5. At this juncture, the learned Senior counsel for the petitioner contended that A1 is a B.E graduate, who lost his father in the retaliation murder. Therefore, he prayed that A1 at least be granted bail based on incarceration.

6. Insofar as the above contention raised by the learned Senior counsel is concerned, this Court is of the considered opinion that education ought to refine a person. In spite of loss of his father, a B.E graduate ought not to have indulged in retaliation murder. Therefore the contention raised by the learned Senior counsel cannot be considered.



CRL OP(MD). No.672 of 2026

WEB COPY

7. Taking into consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case and upon perusal of the video circulated by the prosecution, it prima facie appears that the petitioner has committed a serious offence. In the two CCTV footages which are produced before this Court today, it is clearly seen that the A1 who wears red colour T-shirt hit the deceased at first and thereafter, others followed him and killed the deceased. In such circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

21.01.2026

PJL

TO

1. The Additional District Judge, Sivagangai.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Karaikudi North Police Station, Sivagangai District.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.672 of 2026



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.672 of 2026

S.SRIMATHY, J
PJL

ORDER
IN
CRL OP (MD) No.672 of 2026

Date : 21/01/2026